

From *Annual of Armenian Linguistics*
Volume 7, 1986

ezn 'ox'

ERIC P. HAMP
University of Chicago

This vocable appears to be without an etymology.¹ It is interesting that the lexeme (pl. *ezink'*) shows the same stem class as the well known etymon of Eng. *ox oxen* < OE *oxa oxan* ~ *oexen/exen*, ON *oxe/uxe yxn* < **uhsniz*, Goth. *auhsnuns* (acc. pl.), Welsh *ych ychen*, Bret. pl. *oc'hen*, Toch. B *okso oksaiñ* (reshaped) 'steers', Skt. *ukṣāṇas* 'bulls' (: *ukṣā*), Avestan *uxšānō* (*asnqm*) < IE **uksé*, pl. **uksén-es*, weak stem **uksn-*. It would appear, then, that Armenian has simply supplied a fresh base appropriate to the same formation.

The class of masculine *n*-stems ("weak" stems) in Germanic includes a substantial component of *nomina agentis*, e.g., OHG *gēbo* 'giver', *herizogo* 'army leader', *scolo* 'debtor', *fora-sago* 'prophet', Goth. *skula* 'debtor', *staua* 'judge', *weiha* 'priest'; this characteristic has been well recognized at least since Osthoff *Forschungen* 2, 101 ff. In German the borrowed suffix *-er* (and in Gothic the denominal *yod n*-stem *-ja(n)*, e.g., *arbja* 'der Erbe') has displaced and superseded the old agentive **-an-*; see F. Kluge, *Abriss der deutschen Wortbildungslehre* 2, Halle (Saale) 1925, 30-1. As we see, these nouns were deverbal; see additionally Wackernagel-Debrunner *AiG* II, 2, 175-8 §80a and b.

It is then reasonable to envisage a formation **segh-en-* built upon the verbal base **segh-* (Pokorny *IEW* 888-9; Feist 419; Vendryes *LEIA* (1974) S-68) denoting "strength, resilience, etc." The semantics of *ezin-* < **seghen-* then precisely matches that of Gk. *ὀξύς* < **soǵh-ó-s*, an equivalent and more productive but less marked mor-

phology, and of ὄχυρός. The ox therefore was “the strong and enduring one,” who could survive punishing work. The Armenian term *(s)eğh(e)n- was the morphological equivalent of the Greek name “Εκ-τωρ.

NOTES

¹ Hr. Adjarian, *Hayeren armatakan bařaran*, vol. 2, p. 5-6, calls it a native Armenian word, which its morphology and class would certainly support, as well as its attestation from the Bible on, including compounds and the name Eznik. However, every aspect of its formation has been badly analyzed heretofore. A claim of augmentation by a -n suffix has been advanced with no motivation; we must insist on total accountability in morphology. An IE root *eğh- will not explain the vocalism of OIrish *ag* alongside Skt. *ahí*, Avestan *azi* (Pedersen, *Vergleichende keltische Grammatik* I, 97); even Meillet subscribed to this equation. Adjarian rightly rejects earlier comparisons with the etymon of *ox*, which of course had *u-. Tomaschek and Bugge had it borrowed from a Caucasus neighbour, Jensen tried to relate Hatt. *sin*, Karst Sumerian *isi*, and Marr Basque *edi*; these are just counsels of despair. even Patrubány's attempts through IE with ὄχλος ‘annoyance’, ὄσχος ‘vine-branch’ and μόσχος ‘vine-branch’ and ‘calf’ involve elaborate morphological and semantic difficulties.

Alfred Bammesberger

Studien zur Laryngaltheorie

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht:
Ergänzungshefte zur Zeitschrift für Vergleichende
Sprachforschung, Nr. 33.

159 pages. Price: DM 48.-

The book contains 38 separate studies on the possible reflexes of laryngeals in Indo-European languages. The author tends towards positing only one laryngeal for Indo-European. Armenian is not dealt with specifically.